



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLI, 3.

WHOLE No. 163.

I.—QUINTILIAN OF CALAGURRIS.¹

AN ESSAY.

The noted Spaniard-Roman, to one who seriously and patiently and repeatedly traverses his entire *Institutio*, appears to belong to that class of writers, who, to quote Lessing's familiar apophthegm, would, if they were living, prefer to be praised less, and read more. An author as cyclopaedic as Quintilian either attracts or repels. Used more *per* index, he attracts by the vast total of data and notices and appreciations preserved for us, and treasured by us when in search of things not elsewhere to be found. But Quintilian also repels: classicists as a rule refuse to master the technology of Greco-Roman rhetoric as it has been pursued and in the main become settled in the long period of time from Pericles to Domitian. The belief is widely held that it is just scholastic lumber, which may be left to mould in manuals like Volkmann's or in the storehouses of the lexica. One may be familiar with Aristotle's three books, with the unique² treatise *περὶ ἱψους*, with the works (introductory and appreciative) of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, with the entire range of Cicero's technical discourses from the *torso* of his early manhood, the Hermagorean half-finished treatise *de Rhetorica*, to the *Topica* of his penultimate year; one may then go beyond the elder Seneca, beyond Quintilian and Tacitus' *Dialogus*, and what is saved of the surveys of Suetonius, go on into the arid didactic compilations of Hermogenes, time of the

¹ Calagurris Julia Nassica, in the Tarraconensis of Spain.

² But still technical and didactic; v. E. G. Sihler in *Proceedings of Am. Philol. Assn.* for 1899.

Antonines, or to the slender monographs and *artes* of Halm's *Rhetores Minores*,³ in the very eventide of the classical world, to Marius Victorinus of Julian's time, to Augustine in his pre-baptismal period, bringing us to Theodosius, last guardian of the Roman Empire. But among them all, Quintilian will always hold a very distinguished and peculiar place of his own. Here, too, I must not fail to mention with a sense of deep obligation the technological lexicons of J. Chr. T. Ernesti (Leipzig 1795 and 1797), then, Spalding's great edition in six volumes, begun in 1798 and concluded in 1834 by Bonnell, with the latter's incomparable concordance and index volume as a conclusion. For minor contributions like those of Meister see Bursian's *Jhb.* Fr. Blass wrote his monograph on Greek Eloquence in the period from Alexander to Augustus in 1865 when he was but twenty-two, a remarkable production.⁴ One would look for more in Vol. I of Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship* (Vol. I, 2nd ed. pp. 206-207) than the slender notes there found. I disagree with Sir John Sandys and also with Nettleship when they claim that young Tacitus in the *Dialogus* presented a freer, may I say a more autonomous, estimate of the dignity of Letters *per se* as over against their technical utilization by the *rhetor* and his pupils. The truth is, that the ancillary relation of the study of literature as a propaedeutic to Rhetoric is simply the essence of classic education, from Demetrius Phalereus on to the latest times, and this was again the practice and view of the Humanists, such as Filelfo, who combined (and consciously so) in their own careers the professions of the *grammaticus* and *rhetor*. To the estimates of Quintilian in the current manuals I can refer but briefly. Leo's lines on Quintilian are felicitous, sympathetic, beautiful. Schanz here, I believe, is (§§ 482-483) more searching and penetrating than Teuffel. Bernhardt, however, with the delicate felicity of his estimate, impresses me even more. Simcox (in his *Hist. of Lat. Lit.* Vol. I) has carried into his chapter on Quintilian an itch for dissent which reveals more of Simcox than of Quintilian. Mackail is greatly impressed with the survey of Greek and Roman Letters in B. X, which indeed seems the proper thing

³ Leipzig, Teubner, 1863.

⁴ He meekly repeated after Mommsen, that Cicero was no great orator. I say nothing further, for many were under that thrall.

to do or to be, as though there were a finality in many of those brilliant *sententiae*.⁵ In Dimsdale one misses a firm grasp of Quintilian's work as a whole as well as a finer characterization of the man himself.

Going forward now to my own task, may I not take for granted as familiar the data derived from Quintilian himself, and from Martial, Juvenal (esp. VII, 197 sq.), Pliny's Letters, Ausonius, Jerome, as these are all set down in the current manuals. His father and perhaps his grandfather had been professional *rhetoires* both in Spain and at the capital, I think. It was there that our Quintilian had been educated and begun life as *rhetor* and *patronus* both. When Galba quit the Tarraconensis in 68 A. D. to assume the purple of the principate he "took Quintilian along" (Jerome). Why? Hardly to function in publicity activities in Galba's interest. There were scores and scores of *Rhetores'* schools in Rome at that time. More likely that Quintilian, as the most conspicuous *rhetor* in the Tarraconensis and so, too, often pleading as *patronus* before the Roman proconsul, gained his good will and respect. Clearly, too, Quintilian, whose ideals and convictions shrank from the Neronian capital, as long as it was Neronian, perhaps deemed it opportune, favored, as he was, by the good will of the new princeps, to open his school in the centre of affairs, in the new era expected under the stern and severe Galba. But after the swift passing of his patron and of Otho and Vitellius, Quintilian seems to have maintained himself under the Flavian dynasty. That he held the fiscal chair of Rhetoric to 88, or so, we know, though we are not able to say that the imperial stipend began in 68. Of course he was, even through the imperial stipend, distinguished and without a peer in that vast profession. (Vollmer, Rh. Mus. 46, 1891, pp. 343-348, "Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Quintilians," suggests that we connect Quintilian, X 3, 17, "Silva" with Statius' preface to his *Silvae* B. 4, but this impresses me as far-fetched. Quintilian there refers plainly to rough notes of an advocate in preparing a case.) Quintilian's *Institutio*, begun under Domitian, in 88 A. D., is both a farewell to a profession as well as a survey of the same.

⁵ Aristotle, I venture to say, is by no means antiquated. That great analyst deals with the fundamentals in his own incomparable way.

Of course, he would not have written the ultra-devotional passages referring to Domitian *after* September 18, 96. After, and I believe, in consequence of, publishing his first three books, Domitian had entrusted to him the superintendence of the education of the emperor's great-nephews (Quintilian IV, Pref. 2). The father of these young princes, Flavius Clemens, fell a victim of the emperor in 95 A. D. Clearly the twelve books of the *Institutio* were done and published before that time. Quintilian has, of course, been severely censured for abject servility, when he extolled the "iudicia coelestia" of the "sanctissimus censor." Here, by the by, I observe a confirmation or recognition of Domitian's favorite public character—as exhibited in his treatment of erring Vestals, his prosecution of unnatural vice, and other measures against decadence (Sueton. D. 8). It is easy to censure Quintilian, I say, but at that time it was simply impossible to refer to the last of the Flavians at all, in any publication, in any other way. Juvenal 4, 90: Nec civis erat, qui libera posset verba animi proferre et vitam impendere vero. In the other passage in Quintilian (X 1, 92), where the triumphator "Germanicus" is extolled as a great *potential* poet, the oblation by the imperial beneficiary is even more unctuous, though not greatly differing from the apotheosis-incense sent up for Caesar's heir by Vergil and Horace. Nothing, indeed, pleased Domitian more than to tell him that he really made a present of the principate to Vespasian and Titus.* The patron of the Augustan poets, indeed, was a much better man. Domitian was consistent in his insistence on the emperor-cult, without any concern as to the reprobation of coming generations. Tacitus and Pliny accepted high preferment at his hands. Later, indeed, when it was quite safe to do so, the one wrote his *Agricola* and the other his *Panegyricus*, works which will damn the last Flavian for all time. *Au reste*, I do believe Quintilian was chosen as chief educator of the heirs apparent on account of his severe censure of current vice and luxury as we now read

* Sueton. *Dom.* 13, Principatum adeptus neque in Senatu iactare dubitavit, et patri se et fratri dedisse. Cf. Statius, *Silvae* I, 5 sqq.; *Thebais* I, 22 sqq. Domitian's enactments for moral reforms, *Martial* VI, 7, 22; II, 60; VI, 2; IX, 6, 8. Cf. Schiller, *Roem. Kaiserzeit* I, 2, pp. 532 sq., where the merits of Domitian are enumerated with great fairness.

these things.⁷ We know that twice Domitian expelled the professional philosophers from the capital (once in 90 A. D. after the senatorial Stoics Rusticus, Helvidius, Senecio and others were executed or banished). I may mention Epictetus and Dio of Prusa. Literary works were burned; in fact, the trials for *maiestas* were mainly caused by books written by avowed Stoics among the Roman aristocracy. Students of Tacitus and the younger Pliny know with what warm sympathy these senators referred to those champions of freedom later on, and with what wise discretion, in their own public career, they abstained from any personal profession of Stoicism; they never joined the sect. Now Quintilian with unmistakable slur refers to professed or to professional philosophers: *Philosophiam ex professo . . . ostentantibus, parum decori sunt plerique orationis ornatus maximeque ex affectibus quos illi vitia dicunt* (the Stoics) . . . *non conveniunt barbae illi atque tristitiae* (XI 1, 33 sq.). But, on the other hand, the evidence in Quintilian's own work is conclusive, nay overwhelming, that his deeper convictions and sympathies in morals and ethical questions were simply *Stoic*. Let us see. The theory that moral judgment is innate in man and not (as the Epicureans held) something adventitious or a utilitarian product of experience: *modo nulla videatur aetas tam infirma quae non protinus quid rectum pravumque sit, discat* (I 3, 12; II 20, 6). The ideal Sage: *nam et Sapientem formantes eum, qui sit futurus consummatus undique et, ut dicunt, mortalis quidam deus*⁸ (I 10, 5). *Oratio, qua nihil praestantius homini dedit providentia* (I 10, 7). *Eius sectae, quae aliis severissima, aliis asperrima videtur* (I 10, 15). He names it not. Of the higher aim of the advocate's profession: not fees, "*sed ex animo suo et contemplatione et scientia petet perpetuum illum nec fortunae subiectum*" (I 12, 18). *Dedit enim hoc providentia hominibus munus, ut honesta magis iuvarent* (I 12, 19). *Deus ille, parens rerum fabricatorque mundi* (II 16, 12). *Rationem igitur nobis praecipuam dedit eiusque nos socios esse cum deis immortalibus voluit* (II 16, 14). *Animus ille coelestis* (ib. 17). He cites Kleanthes

⁷ E. g. I 2, 6: *Mollis illa educatio, quam indulgentiam vocamus, nervos omnes etc., etc. . . . nostras amicas, nostros concubinos vident, omne convivium obscenis canticis strepit etc.* Cf. I 8, 9.

⁸ Stob. Eclog. II 7. Seneca, Haase's Index, s. v. *Sapiens*.

on τέχνη⁹ (ars). Oratory belongs to the category of the *intermediate* pursuits,¹⁰ ethically considered: *illa quaestio est maior: ex mediis artibus, quae neque laudari per se, nec vituperari possunt. . . .* (the ἀδιάφορα), habenda sit rhetorice (II 20, 1). Zeno's comparison of logic and oratory with fist and open hand had long become the traditional property of the schools (II 20, 7). Rational speech an intrinsic endowment of man (this again an Anti-Epicurean thesis) III 2, 1. (Cf. Lucretius V 1026.) Corporis quidem *fortuitorumque* (III 7, 12). So, too, a little further on, in his theory of *laudatio* and enumeration of gifts: *nam omnia quae extra nos bona sunt* (τὰ μὴ ἐφ' ἡμῖν of the Stoics) *quaeque hominibus forte obtigerunt* (III 7, 13). The Stoics (as above) are hostile to πάθη and so they eliminate *move* from the postulates of oratory: *namque et affectus duplici ratione excludendos putabant*¹¹ (V Prooem. 1, cf. XI 1, 33, above).

As to *Providence*: in quo inter Stoicos et Epicuri sectam secutos pugna perpetua (unbroken from the beginning) est: *regaturne providentia mundus* (V 7, 35). Or again a "Thesis": cum providentia mundus regatur, administranda est respublica (V 10, 14; repeated § 10, 89; XII 2, 21). Ut qui mundum nasci dicit, per hoc ipsum et deficere significet, quod deficit omne quod nascitur (V 10, 79).¹² Again, one of the fundamental and incessantly quoted tenets of the school: plurimi . . . *magistrum respicientes naturam ducem sequi*¹³ desierunt (V 10, 101; VII 1, 40). In his bitter grief over his utter bereavement: nullam in terram despicere *providentiam* tester (Prooem. VI 4): non sum ambitiosus in malis: I do not desire to make a Stoic display of fortitude (ib. 7). His son's fine gifts: *etiam illa fortuita* aderant omnia (ib. 10). Again the antithesis of the two schools: an atomorum concursu mundus sit effectus? An providentia regatur? An sit aliquando casurus? (VII 2, 2). The antithesis of these schools in cosmology and theology (VII

⁹ Diog. Laert. VII 174.

¹⁰ Propterea ἐγκύκλιοι τέχνηαι etiam μέσαι ab iis nominabantur, *Ritter et Preller*, ed. Wellman 1913, no. 522 C.

¹¹ Perhaps Chrysippus himself was meant; he wrote a treatise in four books, περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς, Diog. Laert. VII 201.

¹² Diog. Laert. VII 141.

¹³ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν, Diog. Laert. VII 87.

3, 5). The size of the sun (VII 4, 1; 2, 6); number of worlds (ib.); of Cicero: dono quodam *providentiae* genitus (X 1, 108). He makes fun of the *εἰδωλα* in the Epicurean philosophy of perception (X 2, 15). Here, too, belongs the praise of Socrates, the incarnation of the ideal Sage (XI 1, 10 sqq.), and of Rutilius (ib. 12) and of the younger Cato¹⁴ (XII 7, 4). But enough: he was in his deepest convictions a Stoic, though not in any public display or visible conformity. When, near the conclusion of his great work, he inquires as to a permanent moral code for the advocate and orator, what do we see? He rapidly enumerates *all* the sects and schools, but the Stoics are outlined last and with an unmistakable modicum of appreciation.

But to proceed. Quintilian gives a systematic and very thorough exposition of the traditional elements of rhetorical τέχνη¹⁵ with very full and constant reference to those who contributed to it, even in minutiae; but much more important to the modern student, I take it, is his effort to establish or re-establish thorough study of Cicero as the exemplar of Roman oratory, and *pari passu* to carry on a running polemic against the "*causae corruptae eloquentiae*," against the decadence and decline from that standard. All this is, as we all know, a theme fairly identical with that of the *Dialogus* of young Tacitus, written, I am quite sure, under Vespasian. As to this famous and brilliant treatise,¹⁶ there have been various theories, but most of us now are agreed, I believe, as to its main contentions. The freedom of debate and discussion of the Ciceronian era, which alone made great oratory possible, had passed away, all greater issues were now determined by the *princeps*: no more was there "*splendor reorum et magnitudo causarum*." Tacitus is well satisfied with the vanishing of the evils which were symptomatic of the decline

¹⁴ Cf., on the same three Stoic saints, Seneca, *Ep. Moral.* 24.

¹⁵ L. Spengel's study, "Die Definition und Eintheilung der Rhetorik bei den Alten," *Rh. Mus.* XVIII (1863), is still unexcelled, I believe, as a historical and technical survey (pp. 481-511).

¹⁶ The amassing of erudition in Gudeman's noted edition, 1894, is known to us all and admitted, but it is somewhat excessive. Ed. Norden's suggestion to place the *Dialogus* in the post-Domitianic period of Tacitus impresses me as psychologically impossible (*Antike Kunstprosa*, I, 1898, p. 325). The data concerning Maternus are too slender to permit generalizations as sweeping and positive as those which Norden makes.

and fall of the Republic, but he knows, too, that these very evils "ingentem eloquentiae materiam subministrabant" (Dial. 37). After Actium political oratory certainly was narrowed or curbed: maxime principis disciplina ipsam quoque eloquentiam *sicut omnia alia pacaverat* (38), or: cum de republica non imperiti et multi deliberent (in the Senate) sed sapientissimus et unus (41). It is flattery but it is not sincere flattery.¹⁷

But, inasmuch as the decline and decadence of oratory was manifested in a peculiar and decisive way in and through the rhetors' schools in the capital itself, and since we possess a unique delineation of these schools in the old-age reminiscences of the Elder Seneca, it becomes impressively clear, that it was not merely the age of Nero or Domitian, but even that of Augustus and Tiberius, say from 31 B. C. to 37 A. D., in which this stunted and artificial eloquence was nourished, practiced and firmly established.¹⁸ Both matter and manner were brought into Rome by Greek professionals, who of real political oratory, as a matter of experience or observation, knew simply—nothing. Even those Greeks who taught in Rome during Cicero's boyhood, seem to have used as their chief tools the *suasoriae* and *controversiae* as we find them in Marcus Seneca. A somewhat closer vision of schools, teachers and practice will surely equip us to follow Quintilian's censure and polemic with better judgment. In Cicero's Latin elaboration of Hermagoras, even, we have a purely Greek controversia (II 95):

"Ne quis Dianae vitulum immolaret. Nautae quidam, cum adversa tempestate in alto iactarentur, voverunt, si eo portu, quem conspiciebant, potiti essent, ei deo, qui ibi esset, se vitulum

¹⁷ Cf. Tac. Ann. 12. While writing under Vespasian, in the *Dialogus*, Tacitus adjusted his convictions much more to his desire of advancement than later under Trajan, when freedom of speech was really secure. The sentence (Dial. 40): "magna illa et notabilis eloquentia, alumna licentiae quam stulti libertatem vocant," was, I believe, written for effect with Vespasian, upon whose favor every cursus honorum depended.

¹⁸ One cannot fail to gain the conviction from the entire congeries of reminiscences (of the old man), memories interspersed and interlarded with a wealth of anecdote cropping up continually by way of association—one cannot, I say, fail to gain the conviction that Seneca depreciates the entire profession, its standards and performances, and it is really doubtful whether he was a professional himself.

immolaturus. Casu erat in eo portu fanum Dianae eius, cui vitulum immolari non licebat. Imprudentes legis cum exissent, vitulum immolaverunt. Accusantur." Or II 144: "Qui tyrannum occiderit, Olympionicarum praemia capito" etc., etc. Or II 87.

As for the *suasoriae* in Seneca, such were always assigned to the beginners or Freshmen under the *declamatores*; these themes dealt altogether with the *deliberativum genus*; often they were what we should call somewhat large or pompous themes for lads from fourteen to sixteen years of age, themes hackneyed for generations: "Shall Alexander stop at the Okeanos?" Both Greek and Latin Rhetors handled precisely the identical themes and naturally their professional rivalry was keen and often bitter. Homer and Virgil were brought in, or dragged in, wherever possible or half possible. Another: The Three Hundred at Thermopylae deliberate whether they shall stay or withdraw. Or: Agamemnon at Aulis: Shall I sacrifice Iphigenia? Or: Alexander at Babylon: Shall I enter? Or: Shall the Athenians remove their Persian trophies or not? Shall Cicero beg mercy of Antony? Very few *rhetores* in their class-rooms dared to insult his memory (*Suas.* VI 42). Now as to the *Controversiae*: they were meant to be concrete exercises in the *genus iudiciale*, problems before a jury, in law and litigation, on the face of them,—but they were so desperately artificial (nay impossible), that their value as genuine preparation for pleading¹⁹ in court was nil. These "cases" were so devised that the work of argumentation *pro* and *contra* was fairly equally or evenly plausible or pleadable, may I say. The "facts" were generally so builded, that, while wildly improbable in themselves, they furnished a large field for *πάθος*, while argumentation, to be telling or novel, was driven to the *ne plus ultra* often of frigid sophistry. One example must suffice: "He who apprehends an adulterer with his own faithless wife, provided he slays both, shall be guiltless." (Generally a statute leads off.) Now a gallant soldier had lost his hands in war. He comes upon an adulterer with his own wife, by whom he had had a son: he ordered the son to kill (the guilty pair). The son failed to do so. The paramour made good his escape. He (the handless man) dis-

¹⁹ Especially in the Centumviral Courts, where all testamentary litigation was had.

owns the son (I Contr. 4). This specimen is typical, and is as good or as bad as any other. The motives of the chief character for doing or not doing are balanced with the utmost nicety. These themes were handed down, perhaps from the initiative of Demetrius Phalereus (Blass, *Gr. Ber. in dem Ztalter. etc.* 1865, p. 58), for centuries, unchanged and unchangeable. Not only the pupils in the schools declaimed on them, but the *rhetores* or *declamatores* themselves delivered pleas before an imaginary jury on these *controversiae*, as a rule before the parents and friends of their pupils or other invited guests. How could genuine pleader's faculty be here revealed or developed? The really instructive part, for the students, was in the *quaestiones*; the points chosen for argumentation, points legal or purely logical, or moral, or purely psychological were elucidated by the professor—whether before or after his own declamatio, is not quite clear to us. Somewhat distinct from this were the *colores* (χρόματα). The declamator chose and impersonated one of the chief characters in the given *controversia*. The "color" (with which a great part of M. Seneca's reminiscences is occupied) was the general attitude or treatment, rendering as plausible and reasonable as possible the pleading determined upon in the character assumed, often in the task of justifying or glorifying the *motive* for action or non-action.²⁰ The point then that I am here urging is this: The rhetorical schools of the period of Augustus-Tiberius differed little, if at all, from the Neronian period as Petronius (I 4 Buecheler) describes them: the judgment of that keen observer could have been penned by Quintilian himself some quarter-century later. Petronius, with keen satire, seized and presented the faults and deep defects of the rhetorical schools, but also with fair condemnation. He intimates that the teachers are simply forced by their pupils to declaim upon these impossible themes, and that the rhetores would have empty class-rooms if they did otherwise. The fathers must share in the fault. One may take Petronius as an introduction to the reformatory design of Quintilian. Like M. Seneca, he calls teachers and pupils *scholastici*. Juvenal, in the generation *after* Quintilian, had been through the profession and was indeed quite through with it. We all know that his *satirae* were really

²⁰ Juvenal VI 280: *dic aliquem, sodes, hic, Quintiliane, colorem.*

versified *declamationes*; see especially 7, 150 sqq. To him Quintilian is the type of the supremely *lucky* rhetor, while Remmius Palaemon stands for the supremely *lucky grammaticus*. The Greeks led in the profession. Caesar and Augustus distinguished Apollodorus the rhetor; Tiberius, from his Rhodian sojourn on, similarly singled out Theodorus. Cicero always gave the strongest professional preference to Greek teachers, such as *Paionios* (ad Quintum Fratr. III 3, 4)²¹ and refers to him as an adept in "*illo declamatorio genere*." M. Seneca never seems to have asked himself, why these Greeks *could not* bring any genuine *political* eloquence to the capital. Of course they could not. Their professional primacy seems to have been universally admitted, though bitterly endured, by the Latin teachers. M. Seneca always cites them much more briefly and, as a rule, after the Latin teachers. One may fairly conclude from M. Seneca that these Greek professors competed mainly with one another, but that they at the same time set the standard for their Latin fellow-professionals. The Roman observer from the colony of Corduba expresses his preference: his special compatriots, like Latro, Gallio, Turrinus, clearly hold his warmest affection. He records with great satisfaction, when a turn by Albucius of Novara outshines or overtops the Greeks (praeminet Graecos, I Contr. 4, 12). Augustus himself sometimes listened to a Greek, but only in December; with him appeared Maecenas and sometimes gave a hint to a declamator to shorten his discourse (so to Latro, Contr. II 4, 13). Even Agrippa sometimes sat in an auditorium. Not one of the score or more of the Greek rhetores is assigned to Athens by Seneca, although there was a conscious display (much of it, I believe, in *delivery*) of the difference between the "Attic" and "Asianic" manner (X 5, 21). Seneca's sympathies sometimes find vent in an angry phrase, as "*insolenti Graeciae*" (I Prooem. 6). The fact is that M. Seneca of Corduba under Augustus-Tiberius was a Ciceronian of deep conviction, just as was Quintilian of Calagurris under the Flavian dynasty: "*quicquid Romana facundia habet, quod insolenti Graeciae aut opponat aut praeferat, circa Ciceronem effloruit; omnia ingenia quae lucem studiis nostris attulerunt, tum nata sunt.*" Then came the decadence: nihil

²¹ Cf. E. G. S. ΘΕΤΙΚΩΤΕΡΟΝ, Am. J. Ph. 1902, pp. 282 sqq.

enim tam mortiferum ingeniis quam luxuria est; then Seneca, in a somewhat veiled and impersonal way, comes upon the *delatores*, who could be no other than those of Tiberius' later years: sive, cum praemium pulcherrimae rei cecidisset, translatum est omne certamen *ad turpia multo honore quaestuque vigentia* (cf. Tac. Ann. IV 30). Even Pollio, the proudest orator of the Augustan period, sometimes appeared in the school-rooms and not merely as a condescending patron and critic: once he listened to his grandson declaiming, and after a detailed criticism of his own, declaimed in the negative himself (IV Praef. 3).

But Seneca, too, puts his finger on the very genetic point of what to him and Quintilian, too, was *corrupta eloquentia*: *Memini Oscum cum loqueretur de hoc genere sententiarum, quo infecta iam erant adolescentulorum ingenia, queri de Publilio (Syro), quasi ille iam hanc insaniam introduxisset* (VII 3, 8). These pithy, pointed, pregnant passages were the *sine qua non*, by which the professors gained or maintained their professional standing. These *sententiae* were quoted about the capital (circumferebantur); they were considered gems with which speeches or history could be adorned. I have no space to illustrate the matter at length. Collections of a rhetor's *sententiae* were published, as Latro's (II 3, 18). From such Ovid cribbed heavily (II 2, 8). There were chronic animosities about these things. Language and literature (as between the *recitationes* of the aristocracy and the *declamationes* in the schools) were really running to seed. Of course, the wonderful Lucius Seneca did not introduce nor originate the *sententia*, though he was no doubt the incomparable exemplar of it, and dwelled apart. We may assume that Quintilian's insistence on the study of Cicero was rather limited to his own class-room; he, and he alone, could afford to defy the prevailing mode. Now his *Institutio*, in its wide sweep and comprehensive survey of the work of some five centuries, may fairly be called a *συναγωγή τεχνῶν*. Need I say that in him (as in all his class) there was a bilingual consciousness? So in terminology. The historical survey in every school-room had to begin with the types exemplified by Nestor, Menelaus, Odysseus,²² including Pericles, and down to Demos-

²² Cf. Pliny, Epp. I 20.

thenes *de Corona*. We marvel how Porcius Latro fared here: "Graecos enim et contemnebat et ignorabat" (X 4, 21). It is noticeable that Quintilian, while freely admitting the practical superiority and the originality of Greek *termini technici*, endeavors where possible to append Latin equivalents. I have gathered from his practice very many instances: there is space here for a few only: *vocalitas*, εὐφωνία (I 5, 4); *accentus*, προσῳδία (I 5, 22); *οὐσία*, *essentia* (III 6, 23); *illa sequentia*, παρεπόμενα (V 10, 75); *ex circumstantia*, quia περίστασις aliter dicere non possumus (V 10, 104); ἥθος he tries to latinize or define as "*morum quaedam proprietas*" (VI 2, 9). He refers to Latin authors of *artes* who thus evidently strove to emancipate Latin schools from Greek domination, authors of his own time to whom he never refers by name, but only as *quidam* or *nonnulli*. My impression is that he cited these Latin equivalents in a tentative way, but not as his own. He never even tries to latinize *grammaticē* or *rhetoricē* or *dialecticē*; nor *tropos*, as a rule. Clearly the Greek terms were the current tool of the *scholasticus*, whether Greek or Roman.

As for Quintilian's personal and professional erudition, it was large and sweeping, larger than that of his Greek fellow-teachers, who could afford to ignore the Latin side. Quintilian was, we must not forget it, the visible and envied head of a great profession. Now in this fusion of personal erudition and culture with the technical postulates of his profession, Quintilian neither sought any display of learning nor did he affect an independence or indifference to the same, which would have been both impossible and absurd. Indeed, he strives to guide the present and to instruct the future teachers of eloquence, and this, too, while he himself classifies himself as a "*declamator*" (IX 2, 83). We are all familiar with the comparative survey of the ten classes of letters (X 1). Fully equipped with all the lore of the *grammaticus*, the rhetor, with his study of, and incessant perfecting of himself in, *argumentatio*, had to traverse a very positive amount of philosophy, often beginning with Cicero's famous introductory and hortatory discourse, the *Hortensius*. Incidentally, Quintilian cites the Pythagorean Archytas (I 10, 17); Pericles and the Eclipse (I 10, 47); Plato's range of culture (I 12, 15); the γραφή παρανόμων at Athens (II 4, 33); the average *rhetor* is not familiar enough with Plato's Gorgias (II

15, 24); a point of general agreement between Stoics and Peripatetics (II 17, 2). Quintilian is thoroughly familiar with Aristotle's Rhetoric, he cites also the Stagirites' Dialogue *Gryllos* with an "*ut solet*" (II 17, 14). In all of book III, especially in the discussion of *Status* (στάσις) he drew heavily on Hermagoras directly. The ten Aristotelian categories are presented entirely (III 6, 23). Now the Greek rhetor, as I said before, could complacently and successfully ignore the Latin side, but the Roman rhetor, to be first-class, had to make fairly *all* the Greek range a professional achievement, and be prepared to teach it. As for Quintilian's survey in X 1, I cannot share the traditional enthusiasm of classicists: it is all to make *φράσις*, or *copia verborum*, for the orator, a rather narrow mould to hold great letters in. Archilochus, e. g., furnishes *breves vibrantesque sententiae* (X 1, 60), so does Pindar. His critique of Seneca is familiar; I have no sympathy with it. I mean, of course, the prose works of the mature Seneca, not the declamatory monologues in the so-called tragedies of his youth. As for imitating a Seneca! Of course, the step from imitation (would-be imitation) to mannerism is a short and sure one. Oratory, nay the production of all letters, was turned into a show (whether in *schola* or *forum* or in a *recitatio*) and the hyper-emotional effects of the conclusions were quasi-operatic, or quite histrionic (cf. Plin. Epp. II 14, with the paid *clagues*): "*sententiolisne flendum erit*"? (XI 1, 52); "*rasas fauces ac latus fatigatum deformi cantico reficere* (XI 3, 13); *vitium . . . quo nunc maxime laboratur in causis omnibus scholisque, cantandi* (XI 3, 57). He makes the Greeks responsible for some related abuses (XI 3, 103).²³ The schools have emasculated genuine eloquence: they desire to furnish *pleasure* merely (V 12, 17 sqq.). The *declamationes*, which should be like the drill with buttoned foils for preparing for actual battles (in the courts), remind Quintilian of the effeminate beauty of young slaves castrated by the dealers with commercial design. Now the *sententia* has indeed its proper place and function: "*dum rem contineant et copia non redundant et ad victoriam spectent, quis utile neget*?

²³ I append the more important references dealing with the *sententiae* and other excrescences which he combats: I 8, 9; II 4, 31; 11, 3; 12, 7 sqq.; IV 1, 53; 3, 2-3; V 2, 17; 12, 31; 13, 37; VI 4, 6; VII 1, 14; 1, 44; VIII 5 (the entire chapter); XI 1, 52; XII 9, 3; 10, 48.

Feriant animum et uno ictu impellunt et ipsa brevitate magis haerent et delectatione persuadent (XII 10, 48): admirably put certainly. Quintilian himself penned some admirable ones, of which I have made a collection; here I must be content to transcribe but a few: "ut operum fastigia spectantur, latent fundamenta (Prooem. I 4); frequens imitatio transit in mores (I 11, 3); quid aliud agimus docendo eos quam ne docendi semper sint? (II 5, 13); and the famous one familiar to scholars everywhere: ex quo mihi inter virtutes grammatici habebitur, aliqua nescire (I 8, 21); *ambitiosum gloriandi genus est etiam deridere* (XI 1, 22); a dictum of keenest psychological penetration, which, coupled with great moral earnestness, constitutes one of the salient characteristics of Quintilian's personality: nemo nisi sua culpa diu dolet (Prooem. VI 13). On the *will* in study: studium discendi *voluntate*, quae cogi non potest, constat (I 3, 8). He knows how sovereign are the *emotions* in the pleader's profession, and he also analyzes with consummate penetration the real sway of them, viz., the faculty of making remote soul-contents present and real by the creation of mental images of the same (VI 2, 3). As a masterful psychologist, Quintilian was indeed independent of (however familiar with) manuals²⁴ and systems. And he was also an expert pleader: You must not overload the juror with an excess of argumentation; you will weary him and impair your credit with him (V 12, 8); the task of the defender (*patronus*) is vastly more difficult than that of the *accusator* (VII 2, 35-36); patronus neget, defendat, transferat,²⁵ excuset, deprecetur, molliat, minuatur, avertat, despiciat, derideat (V 13, 2). What line to choose before the emperor, what before a jury (ib. 6-7). Indeed it is the court and the soundness of the pleader's professional conduct — not merely his preparation — which Quintilian has in mind, what kind of man the actual advocate should be, his service in court, faults there which Quintilian passes on in detail and severely, a rigid review and censure which no mere *declamator* of that time in the capital would have been competent to make, nay which he would not have dared to publish, for it is the practical results of the schools which Quintilian

²⁴ Quae quidem non aliquo tradente, sed *experimento meo* ac natura ipsa (this again in the Stoic vein) duce accepi VI 2, 25.

²⁵ The status *translationis* in Hermagoras.

condemns, and not merely *obiter* (in XII 8); he also deals with the fee-system then prevailing ²⁸ (XII 7, 3).

It is indeed a remarkable work, this *Institutio*, attending the orator from the cradle to forum and Senate: but there remains one question, a very incisive question: Was the critical and combative purpose stronger in his mind, or was it the constructive design of the whole? This is one of the *imponderabilia* of historical research. No comfortable and impressive summarization is quite safe here. "Non enim doceo, sed admoneo docuturos" (I 4, 17). The detailed notes on language and grammar in book I are merely reminders to the current grammatici to deepen their scholarship: grammaticos officii sui commonemus (I 5, 7). His general aim is not merely to condense or repeat manuals and monographs, nor to add a new *ars* to the vast total of *artes* extant, but to train the future orator by having him pattern after the great exemplars of eloquence, by concrete study of their texts. He has before his mind *the ideal orator*: noster orator II 17, 23; the consummatus orator II 19, 1. After all, great eloquence preceded the theories thereof (V 10, 120). Beware of relying on technical books! He knows the Apollodoreans, the Theodoreans, the Hermagoreans; he is familiar with manuals and monographs, such as those of Celsus, Cornificius, the older Gallio, Laenas, Virginius, the elder Pliny, Tutilius; but: "neque me cuiusquam sectae (clearly they all had followers) velut quadam superstitione imbutus addixi" (III 1, 22); contemporary specialists, as I suggested before, must be content with being referred to as *quidam*, *alii*, *nonnulli*, sometimes *plerique*; or *putant*, or, in dissent, *illi subtiles magistri* (XII 10, 51).

Shall we call his most cherished ideal Ciceronianism? I should not like to put it in so simple and convenient a term. Personally, he did not essay the graces of symmetrical periods. He sought no mere rehabilitation of a manner. Brutus, Calvus, Pollio, had abandoned Cicero's leadership in the latter stage of the Arpinate's career. The *scholastici* of the elder Seneca's time seem to have cared little for Cicero any more. But the teacher from Calagurris was indeed an expert in Cicero; he

²⁸ Add I 12, 18, *stips advocatum*. For other data revealing Quintilian as a pleader, cf. V (the entire book), VII 1, 63; VII 4, 11; VI 2, 5; VII 4, 11; XII 5, 5-6.

certainly owed the best he was and his very essence as a leading, as *the* leading, teacher of oratory in Rome, to this being imbued with Cicero, not only with the orations, but the theoretical treatises as well, from the half-finished *ars* of Cicero's early years, to the *Topica*, near the sunset of his career. As for the speeches, Quintilian made most didactic use of the Cluentiana, Ligariana, Miloniana, the Verrines; in a second class we may put the Corneliana (lost), the pro Caelio, the pro Murena, the pro Oppio (lost), the Philippics, the pro Vareno (lost). In his own vernal or germinative period, in his first sojourn at Rome, Quintilian was acquainted with the eminent Ciceronian scholar Asconius Pedianus (I 7, 24). Quintilian's great exemplar during that earlier residence at Rome, never a preceptor (for D. A. was a senator of praetorian rank in 26 A. D., before Quintilian was born, v. Tac. Ann. IV 52), *Domitius Afer* of Nemausus in the Narbonensis, must have been a Ciceronian, otherwise he would not have made the impression on Quintilian which he actually did. And I hold it more than probable, that those who studied oratory then in Spain, Gaul, Africa, not obsessed as they were by the morbid competition of the *scholastici* of the capital, sought their models and authority in the great Roman orators of the Ciceronian era. Quintilian had examined autographic data or readings in Ciceronian and Virgilian mss. in Rome (e. g. we may assume in the Palatine library: quo modo et ipsum et Vergilium scripsisse *manus eorum* docent (I 7, 20). Caesar is often referred to, without any genuine citation, however, from his works; Pollio's four orations are cited a few times; of Corvinus Messala, a single speech; of Caelius or Curio, nothing material. These, with Cicero at their head, were the *antiqui* of Quintilian and of Tacitus' *Dialogus*. Quintilian's grasp of their individual characters was evidently keen but they were merely satellites around the ruling sun. Of course, imitation *per se* is already a form of decline: "nunquam par fit imitator auctori" says the elder Seneca. The *Dialogus* of Tacitus may fairly be conceived as Quintilian *en miniature*, as every careful student of both has felt. There was then a current distaste for Cicero: ille "durus et ineruditus, at nos melius (than Cicero) quibus sordet omne quod natura dictavit qui non ornamenta quaerimus, sed *lenocinia* (VIII Pro. 26). The *recitationes* among the *lauti*, and the long established practice

of the *scholastici* had done their work for more than a century; a genuine return to classic standards such as Quintilian wrought for so earnestly, was probably never attained. The younger Pliny's letters we know: hardly one without some quotable *sententia*, and as for the last great classic among Roman prose writers, Tacitus himself, what do we see? Are not those brilliantly epigrammatic dicta, whether in the inserted oratory of his historical characters, or as they betoken the profundity of his almost uncanny psychological divination, are they not to all of us a veritable *κτῆμα ἐς αἰί*?

As for the deep antipathy of Quintilian for L. Seneca of Corduba, there is one citation chosen by Quintilian concerning which I cannot shake off the impression that it was made with design; it was taken from that awful performance of Nero's teacher and guide when the latter prostituted his rare *ingenium* to furnish a "*color*" for the recent act of the matricide in the villa of the dowager at Bauli: "*qualis est Senecae in eo scripto quod Nero ad senatum misit occisa matre, cum se periclitatum videri vellet: "Salvum me esse adhuc nec credo nec gaudeo"*" (Quintilian VIII 5, 18). It is the only literal citation from that author, and it is an indictment in itself.

E. G. SIHLER.